arXiv:1403.5623v1 [q-fin.RM] 22 Mar 2014

Systemic risk in dynamical networks with stochastic failure criterion

B. Podobnik,[1,2,3] D. Horvatic,[4] M. Bertella,[5] L. Feng,[6] X. Huang,[7] and B. Li[5,8]

[1]*Faculty of Civil Engineering, University of Rijeka, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia*
[2]*Zagreb School of Economics and Management, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia*
[3]*Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia**
[4]*Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia*
[5]*Department of Economics, Sao Paulo State University (UNESP), Sao Paulo, Brazil*
[6]*Department of Physics and Center for Computational Science and Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117456, Republic of Singapore*
[7]*Department of Physics, Boston University, 590 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, USA*
[8]*School of Physics Science and Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai, 200092, P. R. China*

Complex non-linear interactions between banks and assets we model by two time-dependent Erdős Renyi network models where each node, representing bank, can invest either to a single asset (model **I**) or multiple assets (model **II**). We use dynamical network approach to evaluate the collective financial failure—systemic risk—quantified by the fraction of active nodes. The systemic risk can be calculated over any future time period, divided on sub-periods, where within each sub-period banks may contiguously fail due to links to either (i) assets or (ii) other banks, controlled by two parameters, probability of internal failure p and threshold T_h ("solvency" parameter). The systemic risk non-linearly increases with p and decreases with average network degree faster when all assets are equally distributed across banks than if assets are randomly distributed. The more inactive banks each bank can endure (smaller T_h), the smaller the systemic risk—for some T_h values in **I** we report a discontinuity in systemic risk. When contiguous spreading becomes stochastic (ii) controlled by probability p_2—a condition for the bank to be solvent (active) is stochastic—with increasing p_2, the systemic risk decreases with both p and T_h. We analyse asset allocation for the U.S. banks.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Ey,89.90.+N

INTRODUCTION

Phase transitions, critical points, hystereses and regime shifts are basic blocks describing the phase flipping of a complex dynamical system between two or more phases [1]. One of the systems having these properties is the financial system that can be considered as a system flipping over time between mainly stable phase, representing good years, and mainly instable phase, representing bad years. In the financial system, the transition from mainly stable to mainly instable phase can be triggered either by an outside sudden event such as a war or by a bankruptcy of a huge bank where the financial contagion can spread due to interlinks between financial units. The nature of this contagion spreading implies that a network approach can be the best suitable framework to describe not only financial contagion but also financial crises [1–15]. In networks, just like in financial systems, the existing nodes can be rewired, and new links and nodes can be added and removed as time elapses and node's properties can change over time [16–22].

In seminal work on network approach in finance, Allen and Gale [3] argued that a more interelated network may help that the losses of a disstressed bank are shared among more creditors reducing the impact of negative shocks to each individual bank. Using a network model of epodemics where nework is characterized by its degree distribution, Gai and Kapadia [9] showed that a large rare shock may have different consequences depending on where it hits in the network and what is the average connectivity of the network. In contrast, beyond a certain point, such interconnections may serve as a mechanism for propagation of large shocks leading to a more fragile financial system. Beale *et al* [10] focused on vulnerability of financial system, precisely on the friction of interest between individual banks and entire economy. The authors investigated the relationship between the risk taken by individual banks and the systemic risk associate with multiple bank failures. Arinaminpathy, Kapadia and May [11] reported how imposing tougher capital requirements on larger banks than smaller ones can increase the resilience of the financial system. Elliot, Golob, and Jackson [15] reported how integration (each organization becoming more dependent on its counterparties) and diversifications (each organization interacting with a larger number of counterparties) have different effects on cascading failure. Acemoglu, Ozdaglar, and A. Tahbaz-Salehi [13] reported that financial contagion exhibits a phase transition as interbank connectivity increases. If shocks are smaller than some threshold, more linked network enhance the stability of the system. However, for shocks larger than the threshold, more linked network facilitate financial contagion.

*Electronic address: bp@phy.hr

RESULTS

The global financial crisis has urged the need for analysing systemic risk representing the collective financial failure [1, 4, 7–12, 15]. The majority of literature on systemic risk is focused on how the financial system responds to the failure of a single bank. However, in real finance many banks can fail inherently either simultaneusly or at different moments. Here, in order to estimate the collective financial failure when multiple initial failures are possible occuring presumably at various moments, we model complex non-linear interaction between banks and firms by two variants of the dynamical Erdős Renyi network proposed in Ref. [23], where nodes (banks) contiguously fail due to links to both (i) assets and (ii) other banks, and (iii) possibly recover. In Ref. [23], the collective phenomena reported in a financial system—phase transitions, critical points, hystereses and phase flipping—have been described by the dynamical network approach. It has been explained how the network, due to (ii) stochastic contiguous spread among the nodes, may lead to the spontaneous emergence of macroscopic phase-flipping phenomena. In our dynamical network approach, bank i can internally fail at any moment t_i, and once it fails, the contagion spreads at t_{i+1} on i's first neighbours, at t_{i+2} on i's second neighbours, and so on. This approach allows us to calculate the systemic risk at different future time horizons. The probability parameter controlling the macroscopic phase-flipping phenomena [23] determines also that the condition for a bank to be solvent (active) is not deterministic [9], but stochastic.

Qualitatively it is known that more links between banks may reduce the risk of contagion [3]. Recently a model of contagion in financial networks has been proposed [9] where each bank i has interbank assets A_i^B, interbank liabilities L_i^B, deposits D_i and illiquid assets A_i^M, and the condition for the bank to be solvent (active) is $(1-\phi)A_i^B + A_i^M - L_i^B - D_i > 0$ where ϕ is the fraction of inactive neighbouring banks—a bank's assets must ecxeed its liabilities. To account for possibility that many banks can fail at any moment—not only at initial moment—and to account for possibility to estimating bank risk for different future time horizons, highly volatile financial networks in this work are modelled by dynamic Erdős Renyi networks **I** [23]. Applying this network in finance and relating to the model of Ref. [9], in **I** nodes represent banks, and bank i at time t fails if $(1-\phi_{t,i})A_i^B + A_{t,i}^M - L_i^B - D_{t,i} < 0$. The previous time-dependent condition can be accomplished if (i) bank i internally fails randomly and independently of other nodes with probability of failure p—for each bank i, with probability p, $A_{t,i}^M - D_{t,i}$ becomes negative and i fails, regardless of interbank assets.

Besides internally, in **I** bank i can also fail (ii) with probability p_2 if it has less than $100T_h\%$ active neighbours (where i sets its interbank assets) [23, 24]. If not stated differently, here we assume that $p_2 = 1$, implying that if bank i has $< 100T_h\%$ active banks, it deterministically fails. The parameter T_h measures the robustness of bank network—the smaller the parameter T_h, the more robust the bank network. Note that T_h can be related with the criterion for bank failures of Ref. [9]. To this end, let's assume that for each bank there is a linear dependence between asset A_i^B and network degree k—e.g. $A_i^B = k_i$. Since the number of incoming and outgoing links is equal, it holds $A_i^B = L_i^B$. Expressing A_i^M and D_i as proportional to $k_i(A_i^B)$, when i active, say $A_i^M = 0.6k_i$ and $D_i = 0.3k_i$, then bank i is inactive if $\phi_{t,i} \geq 0.3 \equiv \phi_h$ (if at least 30% neighbouring banks are inactive, or alternatively, if less than 70% neighbouring banks are active). Thus, $1 - T_h = \phi_h$. In **I** after a time period τ, the nodes recover from internal failure. In finance, this τ is comparable with an average time a firm spends in financial distress that is approximately two years for U.S. firms [25].

To calculate how the systemic risk—among many different definitions [14], here defined as the fraction of failed banks—depends on the model parameters, first we present an analytical result that holds for mean-field approximation, which is generally valid for a network with large number of nodes and degrees. If internal (X) and external (Y) failures are independent, Ref. [23] calculated the probability, $a = a(p, p_2, T_h) \equiv P(X \cup Y)$, that a randomly chosen bank node i is inactive $a = p + p_2(1-p)\Sigma_k P(k)E(k, m, a)$. This probability is equal to the fraction of inactive bank nodes,



FIG. 1: Dependence of network systemic risk of banks, $1-f_n$ (fraction of failed banks), on network parameters, individual probability of bank failure p, threshold T_h, and network degree, $\langle k \rangle$. We use ER dynamical network of Ref. [23], where banks fail independently of each other. (a)-(b) $1-f_n$ increases with p for varying T_h and $\langle k \rangle$. (c) $1-f_n$ non-continuously increases with T_h. (d) $1-f_n$ decreases with $\langle k \rangle$ for large values of $\langle k \rangle$.

$a = 1 - \langle f_n \rangle$. Here $P(k)$ is the degree distribution of the inter-bank links, and parameters p, T_h, and p_2 are explained in **I**. $E(k,m,a) \equiv \Sigma_{j=0}^{m} a^{k-j}(1-a)^j \binom{k}{k-j}$ is the probability that node i's neighbourhood is critically damaged [23], where k is the number of links of node i, and $m \equiv T_h k$. For $m = 1$ we provide an analytical form of $a = 1 - \langle f_n \rangle$ when $P(k)$ is the Poisson distribution $P(k) = (\langle k \rangle)^k e^{-\langle k \rangle}/k!$—we obtain $a = p + p_2(1-p)(1 + \langle k \rangle - a\langle k \rangle)e^{\langle k \rangle (a-1)}$.

Applying analytical results in finance—where generally there are either small or moderately large number of banks—is limited since for these cases mean field holds only approximately [23]. For these cases, in practice, numerical approach helps us estimate how the systemic risk quantitatively depends on each model parameters and finally enable us to, using regression, estimate what the systemic risk is for a given set of empirically estimated parameters.

For dynamical Erdős Renyi network **I** with 1,000 banks, in numerical simulations each of 10,000 runs is used to estimate e.g. the systemic risk a year ahead expressed as the fraction of failed banks, $1 - f_n$. Each run we accomplish in two time steps and each bank can internally fail in both time steps with no recovery ($\tau > 2$). By fixing parameters $\langle k \rangle$ and T_h, in Fig. (1)(a)-(b) we find that the bank systemic risk, $1 - f_n$, increases nonlinearly with individual bank failure p. In Fig. (1)(a) the systemic risk decreases with the average degree $\langle k \rangle$. Thus, the larger the number of links between banks, the smaller the systemic risk. This result is in agreement with Ref. [2] where it was shown that networks with more links are less vulnerable since the fraction of the losses in one bank is transferred to more banks through interbank links. Note that our choice $k = 15$ is due to Ref.[5] reporting that the average bank in the U.S. was linked to 15 others, however most banks has only few connections while a small number of huge banks have thousands.

In Fig. (1)(b) we report that the more failed neighbouring banks any bank can endure (the smaller T_h), the smaller the systemic risk. In economics, the existence of threshold assumes that when an organization's value (say asset minus debt) hits a failure threshold, the organization discontinuosly can lose part of its value [15]. Due to interdependencies among nodes, individual failues may trigger collective cascade of failures. To this end, with increasing T_h the systemic risk in Fig. (1)(c) exhibits a non-linear discontinuity where $1 - f_n$ suddenly jumps at some critical points in T_h such as $1/2, 2/3, ...$, since link values are integer numbers. Note that Ref. [23] reported a discontinuity in the fraction of active nodes, f_n, when increasing (decreasing) p and p_2, together with the hysteresis property that is the characteristic feature of a first-order phase transition [23, 24]. As stated in Introduction, recently Ref. [13] reported phase transition as interbank links increases. Fig. (1)(d) confirms again that the systemic risk decreases with $\langle k \rangle$.

For many parameter sets ($\langle k \rangle$, T_h, p, $1 - f_n$) obtained from each two-period runs (where $\tau = 2$, thus no recovery), one can perform linear regression analysis $1 - f_n = \alpha + \alpha_p p + \alpha_T T_h + \alpha_k k$, and obtain $\alpha = -0.016 \pm 0.001$, $\alpha_p = 2.2 \pm 0.033$, $\alpha_T = 0.067 \pm 0.005$, and $\alpha_k = -0.0017 \pm 0.0002$. The systemic risk significantly increases with p and T_h, while decreases with degree $\langle k \rangle$. Note that these values we obtained using $p \in (0, 0.1)$, $T_h \in (0.2, 0.8)$, and $\langle k \rangle \in (2, 20)$.

Dynamical network approach reveals one more forecasting benefit. It provides us with forecasting power for generally any future time horizon. For the dynamical Erdős Renyi network **I** in Fig. (1)(b) we show the expected systemic risk when $T_h = 0.7$ where each of 10,000 runs is composed of four steps. If each time step represents, say semi-year period, than two-step systemic risk represents our estimation for systemic risk a year ahead, while four-step systemic risk represents our estimation for systemic risk two years ahead. As expected for the case with no recovery, four-step systemic risk is larger than two-step systemic risk. Similar result we obtain in Fig. (1)(c) where for $\langle k \rangle = 8$ we show that four-step systemic risk is substantially larger than two-step systemic risk. Note that these results we obtain under assumption that banks and assets, once failed, do not recover. Clearly, in more reliable dynamical network approach one should also define how assets and banks recover over time after, for example, the government intervenes in the market.

Fig. (2) shows that with increasing parameter p_2—decreasing p_2 from 1 to 0.6—the systemic risk decreases with both p and T_h, that is a reasonable result since $p_2 = 1$ implies that a bank deteministicly fails when a criterion for insolvency $(1 - \phi_{t,i})A_i^B + A_{t,i}^M - L_i^B - D_{t,i} \langle 0$ is fulfilled, while when $p_2 \neq 1$, there is some chance that the bank will not fail. This unpredictability is something



FIG. 2: With decreasing parameter p_2 (from 1 to 0), the systemic risk decreases with both (a) p and (b) T_h. We set $\langle k \rangle = 8$ and $T_h = 0.5$ in (a).

that really occurs in real market, since bankruptcy is not deterministic event. However, stochasticity is not important only at microscopic firm (bank) level. Ref. [23] reported that introduction of stochasticity leads to emergence of macroscopic phase-flipping between "active" and "inactive" macroscopic phases that are demonstrated in Ref. [24] for "expansion" and "recession" phases in economy.

In the previous network **I** it was assumed that each bank can independently internally fail. Next we propose another network model **II** (see Methods), where each bank can put its money not only in other banks, as in **I**, but also in different illiquid asset classes A_i^M, where different banks can invest in equal assets A_i^M, so banks' failures are not independent. In contrast to banks' failures, A_i^M failures are assumed to be independent to each other. For simplicity, we define that firms can affect banks, but not vice versa as in [9, 11, 26].

In the following simulations we include recovery process. In **II** there are four time steps in our analysis, but this time we change the time period needed for recovery, τ. For (i)-(iii) ER dynamical network with finite number of banks, $N_b = 1000$, and assets, $N_f = 10$, our numerical simulations in Fig. (3)(a) confirm that the systemic risk calculated for bank network—defined by the fraction of banks in failure—increases with the individual probability of asset failure p, chosen to be equal for each asset. We assume as in Ref. [11] that both large and small banks hold the same number of asset classes, 10. We perform 10^5 simulations in order to estimate expected systemic risk where each simulation itself we perform in four steps with τ meaning that once a bank or an asset is failed, it stays failed for the entire period τ. In all simulations of Figs. (1), for simplicity we set $p_2 = 1$, implying again that if bank j's neighborhood is critically damaged, it deterministically fails. Figs. (3) reveals that this dynamical network **II** exhibits highly non-linear properties. By first fixing parameter T_h, in Fig. (3)(a) for **II** we find that the systemic risk for bank network increases with τ. The longer time a bank stays in failure, the larger systemic risk. In Fig. (3)(b) we show how dynamical approach enables us to estimate systemic risk for different time scales. As expected, with increasing the time horizon, the systemic risk also increases.



FIG. 3: (a) Systemic risk for bank network increases with time spent in failure τ. (b) Systemic risk for different time scales. With increasing the time horizon, the systemic risk also increases.

In Fig. (2)(b) we further find that the more failure neighbouring banks any bank can endure (the smaller T_h), the smaller the systemic risk—this result is also confirmed in Fig. (2)(c) where we find that the larger is the number of links between banks, the smaller is the systemic risk for a given T_h. Note that $T_h = 0$ assumes the case when banks do not affect each other as assumed in Ref. [10]. In agreement with Fig. (2)(c), in Fig. (2)(d) we find that the systemic risk decreases with $\langle k \rangle$.

In order to analyse how banks and assets interact with each other over time, we evolve simultaneously both banks and assets. In Fig. (4) we show how the fractions of failed ($N_f = 10$) assets and ($N_f = 1000$) banks change over time for a given set of parameters, where recovery exists. Note how the periods when many assets are dysfunctional coincide with the periods when many banks are dysfunctional, in agreement with our model assumption that asset failures may affect bank failures in all banks having investments in the failed assets.

Our network model **II** is partially motivated by Beale *et al* [10]. As known in finance, each bank can reduce its probability of failure by diversifying its risk [27]. However, when many banks diversify their risks in similar way, the probability of multiple failure increases [10]. For the case with N banks and M assets, [10] defined the total loss incurred by bank i after one period $Y_i = \sum W_{ij} V_j$, where the failure occurs if its total losses exceed a given threshold γ_i, i.e. $Y_i > \gamma_i$. Here, W_{ij} denotes bank i's allocation in asset j, V_j is the loss in asset j's value taken from a student t distribution, and γ_i is a threshold.



FIG. 4: Dependence between firm and bank networks arises from the dynamical network model where firm failures may affect all banks having investments in those failed firms. We set $\tau = 50$, $p = 0.004$, $p_2 = 0.8$, $\langle k \rangle = 4$, and $T_h = 0.5$. Periods characterized by the largest spikes in the fraction of failed firms coincide with the spikes in the fraction of failed banks. Both fractions of (a) failed assets and (b) failed banks are increased where the fraction of failed banks are characterized by three states, one with virtually no failed nodes, and two states with different fractions of failed nodes.

In Fig. 2, we replaced t distribution by a simpler Laplace distribution (see **II**) and derive a probability of bank failure with two assets with allocations W_1 and W_2:

$$P = \frac{\exp(-\frac{\gamma}{W_2\tau})}{4(1+\frac{W_1}{W_2})} + \frac{\exp(-\frac{\gamma}{W_2\tau})}{4(1-\frac{W_1}{W_2})}(1-\exp(-\frac{(1-\frac{W_1}{W_2})\gamma}{W_1\tau})) + \frac{\exp(-\frac{\gamma}{W_1\tau})}{2} + \frac{\exp(\frac{\gamma}{W_2\tau})}{4(1+\frac{W_1}{W_2})}\exp(-\frac{(1+\frac{W_1}{W_2})\gamma}{W_1\tau}).$$

This expression, numerically tested in Fig. (5), gives the same smile-form for the probability of bank failure as numerically found in Ref. [10]. Next we analyse how diversification of asset allocations affects systemic risk within dynamical network approach. To this end, Ref. [10] proposed a measure to estimate the level of asset allocation

$$D = \frac{1}{2N(N-1)}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{l=1}^{M}|W_{i,l}-W_{j,l}| \qquad (1)$$

in order to quantify the average of the distances between each pair of banks' asset allocations, where $D = 0$ if each bank invests equally in each asset, thus if $W_{i,j} = 1/M$ for each i and j. Thus, when many banks decide to invest with similar portfolios, they may increase the chance to fail simultaneously. In Fig. (6)(a) within network approach, we obtain that the lowest systemic risk occurs when all assets are equally distributed across banks, that is in agreement with the result obtained in Ref. [10] where banks do not affect each other, and systemic risk is defined as expected number of failures. With increasing randomness in asset allocation, where D increases from zero to 1/3, the systemic risk also increases. As a new result arising from the network approach, in Fig. (6)(b) we obtain that the systemic risk decreases with average degree $\langle k\rangle$ faster when asset allocation is more homogeneous.

To see how well the real market can withstand systemic risk, we exam the level of diversification of asset allocation for the U.S. commercial banks. Here, based on 64,289 commercial banks' balance sheet, we analyze their loan allocations in 10 different sectors [28]: Loans for Construction and Land Development Loans Secured by farmland, Mortgages Secured by 1-4 Family residential properties, Loans Secured by multifamily (> 5) residential properties, Loans Secured by nonfarm nonresidential properties, Agricultural Loans, Held-to-Maturity securities, Commercial and industrial loans, others, Available-for-sale securities, Loans to Individuals. The first five sectors are under the asset class of Real Estate which is the biggest part of the banks' loans allocations. Hence we decompose them to smaller sub-sectors. The data are collected from 1/1/1976 - 12/31/2008 and a considerable fraction of the banks have disappeared during the period. We use Eq. (1) to calculate the average diversification of the commercial banks, and find $D = 0.51$, a larger value than $D = 0.33$, obtained for random diversification. It indicates that in real market, diversification of banks puts the systems at a riskier regime than random diversification.



FIG. 5: Smile-form in probability of individual bank failure with two assets with allocations W_1 and W_2. The smallest risk occurs as expected for $W_1 = W_2 = 0.5$. We use $\tau = 2.5$.



FIG. 6: Dependence of diversification of assets on systemic risk within dynamical network approach. (a) Systemic risk increases with T_h for varying D value. D quantifies the level of asset allocation. With increasing randomness in asset allocation, where D increases from zero to 1/3, the systemic risk increases. We use that $p_2 = 1$ and $T_h = T_h'$ (see Methods). (b) Systemic risk decreases with average network degree $\langle k\rangle$.

DISCUSSION

Generally, the systemic risk risk may arise either because banks diversify their risks in firms in similar ways or because banks are linked within a bank network and thus failures can spread contiguously. For the dynamical (time-dependent) network [23] where nodes (i) inherently fail, (ii) contiguously fail, and (iii) recover, stochastic contiguous spreading corresponds to a stochastic condition for the bank to be solvent (active). We demonstrate how the systemic risk depends on dynamical network parameters: probability of individual asset failure p, bank vulnerability parameter T_h, and average network degree $\langle k\rangle$. We find that the more inactive banks each bank can endure (T_h closer to zero), the smaller the systemic risk. We find that the systemic risk highly non-linearly decreases with increasing the average degree $\langle k\rangle$ until it reaches a constant value, meaning having more connections in the banking network reduces systemic risks. In practice, the parameter T_h can be controlled by the government or banks. Our analysis shows that having $T_h < 0.4$ enables the system to function with low risk for a large set of parameters p and $\langle k\rangle$. The dynamical network approach enables to estimate systemic risk in a wide range of financial systems from pension, mutual, and hedge funds to banking system.

METHODS

We define the network model **II** in the following: At each time t, each of N_f assets A_i^M can independently fail where the probability p of failure for each A_i^M is equal and is taken from a Laplace (double) exponential distribution, $\mathcal{L}(x)$. We define that asset A_i^M fails if the Laplace variable x is smaller than some threshold, P_h—thus, $p = \int_{-\infty}^{P_h} dx\mathcal{L}(x)$. For simplicity, assets do not influence each other. Once asset A_i^M fails, it stays in failure with no possibility for recovery.

Each of the N_b nodes representing banks, for simplicity reason, has the same asset and liability values as in example in **I**—so, bank j at time $t = 0$ has $A_j^B = k_j$, $A_{0,j}^M = 0.6k_j$ and $D_j = 0.3k_j$ (here D does not change in time), but the results are robust to different allocations. However, this time the total A_j^M is allocated across N_f assets. Precisely, at initial time $t = 0$ every bank j determines how much money $W_{j,i}$ to invest in asset i, where $W_{j,i}$ is taken randomly from the homogeneous distribution after proper normalization (later we test this assumption), where clearly for each j, $\sum_{i=1}^{N_f} W_{j,i} = A_{0,j}^M$, where the sum runs over all assets. Since at each moment assets can be either active or inactive (failed), at each t, bank j has the total asset equal to $A_{t,j}^M = \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} W_{j,i}\delta_i \leq A_{0,j}^M$, where δ_i can be either one or zero depending whether asset i is active or inactive. The more robust the bank, the larger the fraction of failed assets the bank can sustain without getting failed. Here we define that bank j's node becomes internally contiguously failed due to links to assets if $A_{t,j} \leq T_h A_{0,j}$, where T_h is the given threshold. Bank j internally fails if $A_{t,j}^M - D_j\langle 0$ and from our choice for $A_{0,j}^M = 0.6k_j$ and $D_j = 0.3k_j$ it occurs when $T_h = 0.5$. We define bank node j's internal failure state by spin $|s_j\rangle$.

In our financial network, a bank can fail either due to asset' failures or due to banks' failures. Here the concept of a network is used to model interbank lending and to study the phenomena of financial stability and contagion [2–4]. At initial time, banks create links among themselves through exchanging deposits to insure themselves against contagion [3]. To this end, external failure state of bank node j denoted by spin $|S_j\rangle$ is $|0\rangle$ (during a time $\tau' = 1$) with probability p_2 if less than $100 \cdot T_h'$ % of j's neighbouring links are active [23]. Bank node j—described by the two-spin state $|s_i, S_i\rangle$—is active only if both spins are 1, i.e, $|s_i, S_i\rangle = |1, 1\rangle$. Links between banks are bidirectional. Having two spins, representing a financial health of a bank, assumes that a bank fails either if it made bad investments in firms or in other banks—alternatively if it is surrounded by bad neighbours. Having $A_{0,j}^M = 0.6k_j$ and $D_j = 0.3k_j$ and keeping in mind that $A_j^B = k_j$ is homogeneously distributed to its neighbours, for this choice of allocations $T_h' = 0.7$.

[1] R. M. May, S. A. Levin, and G. Sugihara, Nature **451**, 893 (2008).
[2] D. W. Diamond and P. H. Dybvig, Journal of Political Economy **91**, 401 (1983).
[3] F. Allen and D. Gale, Journal of Political Economy **108**, 1 (2000).
[4] D. M. Gale and S. Kariv, American Economic Review **97**, 99 (2007).
[5] K. Soramaki *et al*, Physica A **379**, 317 (2007).
[6] F. Schweitzer *et al*, Science **325**, 422 (2009).
[7] J. Lorenz, S. Battiston, and F. Schweitzer, Eur. Phys. Journal B **71**, 441 (2009).
[8] R. M. May and N. Arinaminpathy, J. R. Soc. Interface **7**, 823 (2010).
[9] P. Gai and S. Kapadia, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A **466**, 2401 (2010).
[10] N. Beale *et al*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **108**, 12647 (2011).
[11] N. Arinaminpathy, S. Kapadia, and R. M. May, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **109**, 18338 (2012).
[12] D. Delpini *et al*, Sci. Rep. **3**, 1626 (2013).
[13] D. Acemoglu, A. Ozdaglar, and A. Tahbaz-Salehi (2012), http://ssrn.com/abstract=2207439.
[14] D. Bisias, M. D. Flood, A. W. Lo, S. Valavanis, Annual Review of Financial Economics **4**, 255 (2012).
[15] M. Elliott, B. Golub, and M. O. Jackson, forthcoming in the American Economic Review.
[16] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A. -L. Barabási. Nature **406**,

378 (2000).
[17] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3200 (2001).
[18] D. Garlaschelli, G. Caldarelli, and L. Pietronero, Nature **423**, 165 (2003).
[19] R. Parshani, S. V. Buldyrev, and S. Havlin, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **108**, 1007 (2011).
[20] R. Cohen, K. Erez, D. ben-Avraham, S. Havlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4626 (2000).
[21] A. Bashan *et al*, Nature Communications **3**, 702 (2012).
[22] P. Holme and J. Saramaki, Phys. Reports **519**, 97 (2012).
[23] A. Majdandzic *et al.*, Nature Physics **10**, 34 (2014).
[24] B. Podobnik *et al*, arXiv:1401.7450 (to appear in PRE).
[25] A. C. Eberhart, W. T. Moore, and R. L. Roenfeldt, J. Finance **45**, 1457 (1990).
[26] F. Caccioli, T. A. Catanach, and J. D. Farmer, arXiv:1109.1213.
[27] H. Markowitz, J. Finance **7**, 77 (1952).
[28] X. Huang, I. Vodenska, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, Scientific Reports **3**, 1219 (2013).